

1. [My theory of subjective analysis](#)
2. [Practical Realites are Symbols of Emotion](#)
3. [Advanced Ideas are Important Objects](#)
4. [Belief, Perception and Reality](#)
5. [Subjective Perception and Logic](#)
6. [Subjective Emotions are Perspectives \(with logic\)](#)
7. [Perception and Reality](#)
8. [Truth and Logic](#)
9. [Mental Processes and Cognition](#)
10. [Is the field of Emotion and Cognition limited or already understood?](#)
11. [Can Artificial Intelligence be Artistic?](#)
12. [How powerfull and developed is the unconscious?](#)
13. [Truth and Reality](#)
14. [How Does the Mind Process information?](#)
15. [The Components of Consciousness - Mental and Phenomenological Processes](#)
16. [A Discussion about the Mind and Consciousness](#)
17. [How do our ideas influence our emotions?](#)

My theory of subjective analysis

Emotion is subjective - that means that the feelings that humans experience are unique to each individual person - if each person has their own experience then they are going to form different opinions and different ideas than the people they interact with.

But what is emotion? Emotion mean feeling - that someone is feeling something. If someone is feeling something then it feels 'like' something.

If someone is feeling something then they are experiencing emotions. Emotion is an experience - it is something that you feel.

Humans can also think about things - the things that they think about help to make their emotions more complex. However, this also applies to other animals such as dogs - if a dog thinks about their owner then they make their feelings more complex. They are focusing their feelings on their owner, and that generates those feelings. They could also look at their owner, and so on - in order to help to trigger those complicated feelings.

That seems fairly simple - how is someone supposed to know when they are generating an emotion? If they are aware that they are experiencing an emotion then they might notice the emotion.

This applies to all things in life - different objects and experiences cause humans and animals to have emotional reactions. The reactions that they experience could be complicated reactions, or they could be simple reactions.

What would make a reaction simple? What would make an emotional reaction complex? Emotion can have subtlety - so even though there might be a single emotion - say the feeling 'joy' - then the feeling could still be complicated.

Analysis of Emotions

But I am just talking about experiencing emotions and feelings. There is more to life than experiencing emotions. Humans have to think about

things, also.

There are lots of things in life that humans think about. People think about physical stuff like food or other objects in their environment, or different environments that they are in. All the things in someones environment are physical things.

If an object that a person is thinking about is physical then they could imagine it in their mind - 'picture' it. That means that there are lots of things that people can think about - abstract concepts that cannot be imagined by a visual mental picture, and concrete objects that can be pictured. Some concepts can be pictured, however there is a large range of stuff to think about and much of it involves complicated objects or a lot of objects (making it harder for the person to make a picture in their mind of the concept or environment).

What would make an object a complicated object? Someone can picture a human in their mind - however that doesn't mean that they are going to make it emotionally complicated.

What is the difference between just picturing something or someone and thinking deeply about it then? When I say 'picture' what does that mean other than literally making a mental picture of something. Perhaps my use of the understanding of 'picture or mental image' just makes humans think more about whatever it is that they are thinking about.

Practical Realities are Symbols of Emotion

Different objects or experiences in life generate different amounts and kinds of emotion. These experiences or symbols can consistently generate the same emotions and feelings or they could be diverse and inconsistent.

All of life can be divided into different ideas or categories of objects. The different objects can be emotional objects that generate feeling, like someone's pet - or they could be practical objects that someone uses for non-personal purposes.

Then would that just be a matter of analyzing which objects are most important to the person? People do different activities - that then is just a simple matter of managing their lives.

If a feeling is motivating someone to achieve a goal or objective - does that then make them look for an object that will fulfill that purpose?

Goals and objectives are the ideas that people form in their minds based upon what they think they will be capable of achieving and what objects and objectives they will be capable of satisfying.

Feelings can motivate thoughts and ideas - how is a person even supposed to know what an idea is or what a thought that they have is? There are simple thoughts that relate directly to what the person wants and there are more complicated thoughts that are harder to think about. There are also things that are unclear.

That means that an idea can be unclear, simple or complex. If an idea is simple and unclear then it could be understood better emotionally. If an idea is felt well - or naturally understood by the person, then it could be a simple idea because the unconscious mind is usually more simple than the conscious mind.

That doesn't necessarily mean that emotional ideas are simple - emotions can communicate complex concepts or ideas. That is dreams are often very complicated.

Ideas and Symbols

Humans can have an idea about life, or they can think about life in a more simple manner just by idle thinking or daydreaming. However it isn't necessary to daydream in order to ponder ones objectives and experiences.

Daydreaming would be the equivalent of understanding something in a simple emotional manner - however is daydreaming, idle thinking, or emotional feeling-based thought simple, unclear, or obvious?

Those are interesting questions, it means something about the unconscious mind - what does it take for a person to ponder their life - they don't necessarily need to think about their life in a simple or emotional fashion.

Advanced Ideas are Important Objects

Human beings can think simple ideas or they can think complex ideas. How is a person supposed to know if an idea that they are thinking is something that needs further consideration?

There are lots of things that people can think about. Some things that people think about are simple topics that they regularly bring up in conversation. Other things that people think about are things that they emotionally ponder.

How is a person supposed to know if something that someone ponders is something that is important for them? Humans could think about many topics throughout the day.

What is thinking for that matter? When a person thinks they are pondering stuff - they form ideas about life or what they are doing, and they try to make sense out of what is happening.

If someone doesn't make sense out of what is happening, then they might not process what is going on in a situation. Their understanding could be emotional or it could be a practical understanding. A practical understanding could be emotional - that is, if they have a feeling for what is going on then they might also be capable of interpreting that understanding in practical fashion.

Thoughts and Concepts

It doesn't really matter if someone interprets a situation in a practical fashion, as long as they understand what the significant factors are or if they can respond in an effective manner.

Different ideas that the person has could be emotional ideas (ideas about the feelings that they are experiencing) or they could be ideas about what is going on or what their thoughts are. If their thoughts are on their feelings then they could interpret things differently from if their thoughts are coming from the situation.

Therefore, there can be different amounts of focus on ones thoughts or the situation - people can direct their thoughts at life in general or they could direct their thoughts at what they want from a situation.

Situations or life-scenarios impact a humans feelings in various ways - the person could try to interpret what is going on by analyzing either the external sources or what the impact on their feelings is.

Belief, Perception and Reality

In the SOPHIST Plato distinguishes between two kinds of belief - 'doxa' which is the process of thinking, and 'phantasia' - which is 'through sense perception'.

What is the difference between perception and reality? There are different processes of thinking about things. Humans think in different ways about different topics and objects.

For instance, people can think cognitively or emotionally. That means that they can sort of 'feel' stuff - or they can think about stuff (or some combination of the two).

What happens when a human thinks about something - this could be called a thought process or just a period of thinking. People can think as if in a day dream, which might be more of an idle type of thinking - or they could seriously consider different ideas in a logical fashion (which would be intelligent thinking).

What are the consequences of intelligent or serious thinking? If it is thinking about emotions then it could be considered to be emotionally reflective - or if it is thinking about a topic which is related to human beings then it could also involve an understanding of feelings. - For instance emotions and motivation are clearly important for an understanding of politics, any event that involves people, or anything basically - the details are complex.

When humans think they use their feelings to think about things - or the thoughts involve an understanding of feelings. An understanding of feelings could use feeling that the person could feel - or the feeling could simply be thought about.

Logical thinking

What are the different types of logical thinking? There could be ways of thinking clearly about things, or the thinking could involve different supporting points - or some combination of the two.

Thinking that is more logical would probably involve a greater understanding that simply thinking in a simple or inaccurate fashion - what would be an example of logical thinking then?

Some thinking corresponds with reality while other types of thinking are more motivation related. If the thinking is motivated then it is triggered by feelings and emotions -

For any idea there could be many logical or supporting points. A logical point is a point that makes sense or reveals a truth that is accurately represented. If a reality is misrepresented then it is probably not very clear - its 'misrepresentation could be clear however that would be disguising a more accurate truth or logical point.

What would be an example of an argument with supporting points that shows how logic works with the feelings that the mind uses to think? Any topic using different amounts of feeling to think about - in each situation the feelings are different and need to be analyzed.

So a clear idea would be an idea that is clearly understood - since everything in life is subjective then some ideas are going to be understood more clearly by some people than by others. Rating or cool something is or how much someone likes something is subjective - and that might not be clear. However that brings up the point of what a clear idea would be that is more of a fact - something that is not subjective or subject to opinion.

Most ideas are subject to personal opinion, whether it is a reality or it isn't a reality.

Perception vs Reality

There are ideas that humans can think about that involve their perceptions - and there are ideas that involve reality. How is a person supposed to separate out what their perceptions are from what the reality is?

There are perceptions, representations and objects that all correspond with logical or illogical thought. A representation is an object that is represented in a persons mind - for instance, if you see a basketball it is a simple object

in reality but when you think about it in your mind it might be associated with playing a game or having fun - in addition to representing and thinking about the simple visual object in your head.

That means that humans can use representations to think about things. They can represent multiple objects or multiple ideas, and the ideas and objects can be thought about differently in the mind. Using my example of the basketball, if you have different objects and want to think about them all together then you need to consider how each object is thought about in the mind, and then how the mind combines thinking about the objects - because a representation is how something is represented - not necessarily what it actually is.

So what then is the perception vs. the reality? A single object gets represented in a rather simple fashion - usually someone can tell what they think about a single object in their mind if the concept is simple and easy to understand.

That makes sense - simple concepts are less subjective and therefore they are easier to understand. If a concept is easy to understand then it could be more easily figured out if it is emotional or non-emotional - logical or non-logical.

Ideas that are only opinions could be emotional or non-emotional. How much someone likes something is very emotional or related to feelings. What are all the topics or ideas in life that are important or significant? Humans do not think about an infinite number of ideas - there are only a few ideas that are the major categories - at the top of a tree structure of ideas.

Different Concepts and Their Understanding

Some concepts are emotional - these are concepts like desire and fear - and other concepts that relate to the basic emotions. Other concepts are intellectual and these concepts could also relate to emotions, but would relate to understanding emotions not just measuring how strong the feelings are.

Understanding emotions is different from feeling emotions because feelings are simple while understanding is difficult and complex. Intelligent understandings involve understanding the motivations that lie behind the feelings - motivations involve thoughts while feelings do have sources, they aren't necessarily tied in directly with the motivating thought.

Subjective Perception and Logic

Logic is the ability to understand information in a clear way - when someone thinks about something, it can be simple or it can be complex. If it is complicated then it isn't necessarily clear, or something could be simple and it could also be unclear. What then would the difference be between something simple and something complex?

Complex information could be anything that is hard to understand. How does someone know when something that they think about is easy or hard to comprehend? Things that are hard to understand can be related to advanced topics - or they could be simple things in life that are just difficult to think about or are subjective.

If a concept is subjective then it could be an emotional concept - an emotional concept could be a concept that is dependent on a person's feelings or opinions. If someone has an opinion about something - for instance, if they are assessing how much they like something (desire) or if something is interesting (which could possibly be how cool something is) then that is a subjective concept or thought that is emotion or feeling based.

When someone makes a subjective decision or evaluation they are using their feelings to make that decision. That relates to intellect as well as to feeling because someone's opinion is their intellectual assessment of how much they desire something.

Desire, Drive and Interest

How intellectual is desire or drive? Is an interest in something more emotional or is interest more intellectual? What does that mean exactly - for an interest to be cognitive/ Desire could be something that a person thinks about - someone can think about their own desires and motivations, and that could help to make those motivations more clear to them.

If a human understands what their feelings are then it becomes more cognitive and clear. However the unconscious is very complex so there

could be a confusion of feeling or understanding - the unconscious mind gives signals and feelings about what a person really wants or dislikes.

Desire is a human drive - humans and animals drive themselves to have pleasure seeking-goals and motivations. They also think about things in life that relate to those goals. The things that humans think about are cognitive aspects of thought or mind, and the things that cause them to experience feelings are the emotional or feeling-based aspects of the mind.

How does the cognitive (thoughts and intellect) mix with the feeling or emotional aspect of mind? Humans have thoughts, and they have feelings - however how cognition and emotion relate is much more complicated than simply thinking about something and it having a component or aspect that is emotional (a feeling).

Logic and Emotion

There are different aspects of life that are emotional, different things that generate feelings, and these same things can also be thought about - can be understood. If something is understood then it is 'comprehended', feelings can be intelligent and that means that there is something to understand about the feelings.

When a human understands a feeling, what exactly is it that they are understanding? Feelings relate to certain things, and these things can help to classify and define the feeling. Feelings relate to the parts that makeup the feeling. The parts that makeup the feeling are usually simple and direct - if a person can label the feeling anyway. If it is hard to label or pick out the feeling then it would be hard to identify what the source of the feeling is.

Assessing feelings is very subjective because it is hard to label what a persons feelings are. It isn't even clear if humans have the appropriate ways or language to describe their feelings. They don't necessarily even need to be described - when someone is feeling something then it is obvious that they are feeling something - or even if it isn't obvious they still are experiencing emotions.

Emotions were described by Aristotle as being wild and uncontrollable - while reason is the opposite. That is a simple idea to understand - feelings are passionate, while logic is simply thoughts or ideas.

Feelings aren't necessarily passionate - a person can experience feeling and not be interested in their own feelings, however compared to reasoning (which could be understanding concepts and ideas in life, or thinking about things that are intelligent). How could someone define when thought is intelligent then? Feelings can be simple - or they could be complex feelings, while thoughts are also simple - it is the combination of many difficult thoughts that lead to more complicated understandings (a thought could be something like a sentence describing an idea or concept).

Is intellect clear?

How is someone supposed to identify if a thought or idea is intelligent? Humans think about lots of things all of the time, it isn't necessarily clear if those things are complicated or they are simple. Thinking about something to eat could be a simple idea - or could that be a complicated idea?

Dogs and other animals think about what they want to eat - and it helps to motivate them to get that food. The motivation or drive is a survival instinct. The instinct for survival motivates them to get the food - or is it the desire to eat something? That is a complicated question right there.

Assessing the reason behind different motivations is very complicated, or it could be considered to be simple. On one hand, when a human wants something it could be obvious what it is that they want and why they want that, if you consider the basic and important emotions then the basic instincts are rather obvious, however there are often subtle motivations and lesser feelings that humans can experience.

Subjective Emotions are Perspectives (with logic)

There are ways of viewing the world - these ways can be called different perspectives. A perspective is a viewpoint. A viewpoint is a way of looking at something. Since there are different main emotions, then there are also only a few major ways of viewing things in life.

Emotions are feelings - perception is a way of feeling because it is like viewing a specific or related set of objects. What would it mean to 'look at something in one way'? What would be the different ways of looking at something? There are ways of perceiving things from emotional viewpoints - negatively, positively, and neutrally.

Information can be viewed from a positive perspective, some information is objective and it doesn't matter what the feelings are that the person who is thinking about the information has. Which feelings relate to what information then? There are some feelings that can slant how some information is looked at more than other feelings. Would those feelings be described as being key, important or basic?

When an emotion is basic or important, how does it influence the persons overall feelings? There can be an emotional state that someone is in - this state can come from many key feelings or just a few strong emotions or drives.

How is someone supposed to identify if an emotion is important? What is a single emotion anyway? There can be a single state of feeling or a single drive or motivation that is powerful. How would that relate to thinking or thought?

If there are multiple thoughts then there could be a different way of viewing something from each different thought. Thoughts can also have a viewpoint or perspective, basically. A thought could be an idea or understanding that a person has that reflects a viewpoint or feeling.

Different ideas can form a 'theoretical framework' for an emotion or perspective - the structure is theoretical because different feelings are subjective - that means that the ideas can change easily based upon the

persons feelings, and in turn influence other thoughts or ideas - which all contribute to a certain perspective.

Perception

A perspective is more than a way of looking at something - everything is based off of what happens in life, so a perception is a way of looking at behavior or action in the real world (philosophers call this the 'life-world' or the 'horizon'). Reality can be viewed as a whole - or it can be looked at part by part. Similarly, feelings and perceptions and actions all can be looked at individually or as a whole.

Being aware of something means that the person is conscious of that object. A human could also be conscious of the entire world, the life within the world, or some of the world. What does all that mean - human think with words and thoughts and ask questions about themselves and the world - it doesn't necessarily mean anything if they do that kind of thinking - what would make such thinking productive? If they recognize which aspects of the world they are thinking about, how they are thinking about them, and what the feelings and perceptions of those things are.

Perception and Reality

There is a reality to any situation. Different parts of the situation can be observed by the perceiver. Depending on what someone is feeling, different ideas and perceptions could be understood or looked at.

That, however, brings up the question of - what is a perception? If a perception is a way of looking at something then there are different ways of understanding a single experience or event.

Some experiences are unconsciously processed - the person simply feels that way based upon what their mind wants to feel and think.

The person in an experience can try to alter how the experience is felt by thinking about what their emotions are and what is happening in the situation. How is the person supposed to know if their emotions are being influenced? Why would someone care about what they are feeling?

Some decisions are 'subjective' - that means that a decision that a person makes in a situation depends on their emotions and feelings. If they have an idea - then that idea might be something that is influenced by the person in the situation.

Depending on what is happening in a situation, different emotions and feelings are going to be influenced. The person can also influence their own emotions by think about how they want to feel - or what they are feeling.

What else might influence how a person is feeling in a situation that they can control by their own thinking? Why would a person thinking about their own feelings influence how those feelings are felt? They can try and manage their own feelings - or they could think about what they want, or how they are feeling.

Thinking about how they are feeling influences the feelings because the emotions that they are feeling are tied in with their thoughts. Thoughts influence feelings in different ways - a thought could assist a feeling, a thought could hinder a feeling, or a thought could change the nature or positive or negative orientation of a feeling.

Somw feelings can be influenced by the reality in a situation, while others are influenced by what the person is thinking about. Sometimes the feelings might be physical - however those feelings are also influenced by a persons thoughts.

Different Ideas

If a person thinks about an idea - then they are thinking a thought of some sort. That means that something is occurring to them. What could a person think about as an idea? They can think about anything basically, some ideas or thoughts might be partially unconscious or unclear.

Some ideas or thought are going to be linked to different feelings that a person has - and further more there could be groupings of ideas and groupings of feelings that are linked to the thoughts that a person has.

There can also be different ways feelings influence thoughts - positively, negatively, delusionally, optimistically, and with a different feeling that can also change the perspective of the thought.

Truth and Logic

If something is subjective then it is subject to opinion, and isn't like a fact or solid piece of information. Truth and logic can determine how subjective something is, if someone is being accurate then it is logical and makes sense - or is the truth.

Why would it matter if someone was being accurate? What would that mean anyway - to be accurate about something?

It really depends on what the person is accurate about. Lots of stuff in life relates to people's emotions, so therefore that information could be subject to personal opinion.

What sort of information relates to opinion or to human emotion?

Humans have a lot of emotions, feelings can mix with other feelings - for instance sadness and anger can mix together. It is a critical concept to understand that different feelings can combine to form a new, combined feeling.

Different attitudes can also combine with feelings - for instance sad can combine with a pessimistic attitude. An attitude differs from a feeling because an attitude is like an intention, while a feeling is simply how the person is feeling (the two can combine to produce a more powerful feeling/attitude).

In this way attitudes and feelings are separate - attitude is something that is more under the person's control - because they can control what they are thinking about and where they direct their hostility to some degree, while a feeling is the unconscious mind's understanding and feeling of what is happening, which cannot be controlled, only influenced by the person's thoughts.

Tiger's Eye

What happens when someone has a feeling that they don't understand, but have a strong attitude about something? They can have an attitude and

might know what the attitude is for - however that doesn't mean that the feeling that is associated with the attitude is as simple as the attitude.

Attitudes are simple because they are more something that the person is directing towards something - that is what an attitude is after all - something that the person is passionate or violent about.

Feelings can be complicated because they come from the unconscious - the unconscious mind is not as directed as the conscious mind. An attitude could be under control or directed because it is conscious, however that doesn't mean that it is going to be.

People know what the 'attitude' means, and they know what the word 'feeling' means, however these two words are critical to understand because attitudes are directed at something and are more of a force, while feelings are just emotions.

A human doesn't even necessarily need to have an attitude, they could just be feeling emotions. If a feeling or emotion is strong enough it could be considered to be an attitude because it would change the persons demeanor, however perhaps feelings and attitudes could be controlled and mixed in a desired fashion.

Mental Processes and Cognition

What are the significant mental processes? That question is basically asking how the mind works. The mind thinks in various different ways, and it feels in complex ways also.

Humans have different ways of thinking about things – there are ways of framing something from a different emotional or objective perspective. An objective perspective could be an intellectual viewpoint, however, emotions could also be intellectual (combining viewpoints with non-biased information and biased information).

Emotions are basically feelings – emotions are theoretically the basis for feelings, when someone is motivated to do something – then that comes from an emotion, which is a strong feeling. Feelings are shallow because they are more sensory, however when someone feels strongly that should be labeled as an emotion. So I could simply define an emotion as 'any strong feeling'. That is why emotions are the base of human behavior, and feelings are shallow, sensory and stimulation is also a type of feeling.

Humans aren't motivated to do things because of shallow, sensory feelings. That is why emotions motivate people and make them feel more strongly. People don't feel everything deeply – there are an infinite number of feelings, however there are only a few defined emotions. Feelings are how we feel things; while emotions are also how humans feel – they also are more complex because they are deeper than feelings and require more resources for the mind to process.

Feelings and emotions also relate to the other cognitive functions.

Such as the regulation of emotion through the modification of attention, which is a significant mental process.

Humans can change their attention, and what they are paying to - depending on what they are paying attention to and how much and what kind of attention they are giving - their emotions are going to fluctuate accordingly.

What are the different types of attention? Emotions could theoretically tilt someones attention in certain ways.

Attention relates to the different cognitive abilities.

Attention, memory, emotional processes, thinking, and arousal (which is more physiological) are the main ways in which human minds perform. Emotional processes and arousal evokes feelings, while attention, memory and thought are cognitive.

1. Life and Subjectivity

Life is subjective – everything is dependent on human feelings, they determine our perceptions and our emotions, and how everything works. Life is basically just feelings interacting with each other, or is it an intellectual understanding that comes from the experience of life? This is obvious if you look at lesser animals like dogs, who basically just feel and are obviously very emotional or feeling-based. Humans intellectualize their feelings and that is why they are human.

Feelings comprise life – what makes feelings complex? Different objects alone wouldn't seem to be very complicated or intellectual. It must be the emotions that make people intellectual such as love, disgust, contempt, anger, sadness, surprise, and joy. Those emotions come from very complex feelings and understandings. The 'understandings' are basically of other things in life that also comprise feelings.

Emotions are very significant, however there are an endless number of ways of feeling things. Feeling is how something feels, while emotions are the minds intellectualizations. Emotions are more intellectual than feelings. There is the surface way of feeling life and experiences – and there is the deeper way of experiencing life – which basically consists of thinking and experiencing emotion, not feeling.

How could an animal like a dog be described as experiencing life then? Could a dog be described as being emotional, or just something that experiences feeling? It would seem to experience emotions, however they just aren't as intellectual as humans. They probably also experience

feelings, however those would be more basic than a humans and be about food, basic behaviors, interaction, etc.

A humans feelings could be about lots of simple things, or many complex things. A humans emotions could be compared to a dogs.

Personal Goals, Motivation and Emotion

“When people perceive a discrepancy between how they think are and how they would like to be (i.e., between their actual and ideal selves), dejection related emotions such as disappointment, sadness and depression predominate. In contrast, a contrast between how people think they are and how they think they ought to be, (i.e., between their actual and ought selves) leads to agitation related emotions such as guilt, fear and anxiety.” - “Self-Awareness and Self-relevant Thought in the Experience and Regulation of Emotion” Mark Leary and Dina Gohar. 2014. In (Ed.) James Gross, “Handbook of Emotion Regulation” Guilford Press.

How a person perceives themselves is important, however it doesn't necessarily cause agitation related emotions or dejection related emotions. There are other factors that lead to those emotions such as social influence or other goals that the person might be failing. Their emotions come from there general motivation, which is determined by their interpersonal goals and their pleasure goals - which is the goal they have to achieve pleasure.

That would be Freuds sex instinct, and he also mentioned a death instinct. Those two instincts manifest themselves in interpersonal goals, personal goals such as how they would like to be and what they want to achieve, and other motivations that relate to death and sex.

Basically when I describe the death and sex instinct of Freud as 'motivations', it makes it more clear what is going on - if you relate the other goals and objectives that people have such as how they would like their personalities and behaviors and mannerisms to be then you can form a complete picture of the human motivational/emotional/intellectual psyche.

What ideas influence a persons emotions? I just described that the drives for pleasure or the desire for destruction (the sex and death instinct) could motivate people to achieve those desires - however there are certainly other desires that humans have.

So that means that basically all human thoughts, feelings and drives come from the basic desires of pleasure and pain. These could be extremely high cognitions that influence the persons emotions. How could simple thoughts influence emotion? What is so special about the higher cognitive functions?

Dogs have simple emotions - however, could a dogs emotions be described as being deep without the cognitive functions that a human has? A humans stimulation or physiology must be very psychological.

This means that essentially emotions are tied in with thoughts, and that emotions influence our physiology, sensations and stimulation. This occurs because emotions are tied in with physical feelings - they are unconscious while thoughts are merely cognitive.

So what do thoughts achieve then? I described in previous articles that they can be directed and can influence emotions. They also inspire, motivate and direct many complicated, simple or even ordinary feelings.

Ordinary feelings could also be complicated, maybe the multiple objects in life can be misrepresented to form more complicated symbols or representations - this helps to make thought and cognition more advanced - and that in turn makes human feeling more intricate.

Thought and Self-Reflection

What would a 'direct' thought be? Humans self-reflect all of the time, the question is, how complicated is that process?

What is the influence of the unconscious on mental processes?

The unconscious mind is powerful, most processes could actually be viewed as just being unconscious because humans can only exert a small

amount of control over many processes, for instance pulling up a memory could be considered to be a conscious process, however since it takes time to pull up many memories that means that the persons unconscious mind needs to think about things like other associated memories and emotions in order to think more about the memory and bring it up.

Humans have different mental processes. Emotion interacts with thoughts, and it also interacts with physical stimulation. What are the ways in which emotion interacts with thoughts? Emotions and feelings can be intellectual - the way in which they are intellectual influences the persons thoughts - intelligence and thoughts in the mind are basically the same thing.

There is no point to emotions that aren't intelligent - that is basically just what dogs are like.

Is the field of Emotion and Cognition limited or already understood?

Emotion and cognition is a significant field of study. I wrote articles about emotion and cognition and discussed how the mind thinks in various ways - there are different ways of thinking about things and different ways of feeling things.

There are ways that the mind learns new information. There are also ways that the mind forgets information. If I have written everything that is significant about how the mind thinks and feels then it shouldn't really be necessary to discuss other intellectual topics.

What other topic could be a significant field of study?

Medicine is obviously significant. Literature is also significant, however literature just relates to life and the important aspects about life are how people feel emotions and how they think - which I have already discussed in my emotion and cognition articles.

Is Life Subjective?

This article is a 'summary' article - and by that I mean that it is a summary of life. Humans need to understand different things in order to get along in the world. Is all of life subjective? How do people decide if something is cool or uncool, or other subjective decisions like if different celebrities are interesting in such and such a fashion?

It is a simple understanding that humans see items and then some of those items cause them to experience emotions. That is just the start of this article - it might seem obvious that different things cause people to experience different emotions.

What are the necessary requirements for a person to get along in life? How would I know that someone is even understanding these words that I am writing? If it is looked at that way, then the difference between animal intellect and human intellect is very simple and not a large difference.

Animals understand basic things about life and about emotions, and humans have a similar understanding except they can make the understanding verbal, and understand various logical points about the emotional experience in life.

Animals understand how to function in reality very well, they can move around and notice basic objects and how to go around them. They also note various intentions of other animals and humans - what else do they really need to understand?

If an animal understands basic intentions, then it knows how to get along in life because it is aware of the intentions of the other animals that it interacts with - which means that it knows what the other animals are going to do and can predict their behavior.

Emotion and Cognition

What is the influence of a person's emotion and cognition on their overall psychological health?

How someone thinks and feels is obviously going to be important for that person. However, how could I separate how someone thinks about things from how a person thinks about the same issues?

If it is an idea or life experience, then how does the conscious mind process, understand or 'feel' that experience differently from the unconscious mind?

It is subjective to decide how 'aware' someone is of their own thoughts and feelings about an event - if it is just processed or if it is really understood.

How then could someone define when an experience is felt or thought about? If there are different components to the experience then it could simply be viewed by its different components and if each of those parts is processed by the subject.

Therefore an experience should have different components that can be measured - there is the number of significant feelings involved, the 'emotional intelligence' of the feelings, the unconscious implications of the

feelings, the amount the feelings are thought about consciously - the amount of 'meta' reflection, and the influence of the experience on other feelings and thoughts or ideas the person might have.

Meta Reflection

In the previous section I used the word 'meta' reflection, which hasn't really been defined academically yet, however if you think about it then if there is a meta-cognition and meta-reasoning then there is also a meta-reflection.

After all, reflection is when a person thinks about their ideas, thoughts, emotions, etc. Therefore it is basically like the term 'meta-cognition' except it is implying that the person is 'reflecting' on something instead of thinking about their thinking. So they could be just thinking about experiences and their own thinking at the same time.

I have talked about cognition and emotion in many previous articles, and how thoughts relate to feelings is very important for people to understand because they will be capable of influencing their own emotions and their own intellect - which is basically their conscious mind, while their emotions are basically their unconscious.

Abstraction, Logic and Thoughts

How could a thought be 'abstracted'? What would it mean to abstract a thought? Thoughts are related to feelings, and some thoughts are more logical than other thoughts - so if a thought is abstracted then it could be made to have more feeling.

What would that mean, however - to 'give a thought more feeling'? If thoughts have feelings attached and associated with them, then their associated feelings could be made to be stronger or contain more information.

The idea that a thought could be made to have more feeling is interesting - it is obviously true, however it might be hard to define what a single

thought is or what a single feeling is. Thoughts and conscious, cognitive thinking have feelings that are associated with the thinking.

I mean, how is someone supposed to identify a single feeling - if they are holding a apple they can say 'I can feel this apple' - that would be like a single feeling. Apples are red.

Can Artificial Intelligence be Artistic?

Can a computer be built to be as intelligent as a human being? What intellectual superiorities do humans have over any advanced artificial intelligence computer?

Computers could not be programmed to analyze emotional responses in an adaptive fashion. They could be programmed to respond to emotions individually - for instance they could program a feeling into a computer and have the computer respond to that feeling, however there are many different subtleties to any feeling.

Can the different subtleties to any feeling be described and programmed? There are different components to any feeling in the real world or internal stimulation (such as thinking or physical feelings). Computers will never really have any feelings because they are not biological, or they are not 'alive'. Feelings come from physical stimulation - or feelings are simply physical processes.

Feelings are physical processes that come from emotions that people experience. The emotions that people experience come from stimuli in the world or internal cognitions. So the question then is, what makes a feeling subtle? Is it a deeper way of feeling or is it a more complicated way of feeling?

If it is a more complicated way of feeling then it could be programmed into a computer, but what kind of information does a complicated feeling convey that is different from a more deep or intense feeling? Maybe a deep feeling has more information that is related to that single feeling that is connected in the real world.

So feelings that are simple might have more details that are just related to one thing in the world. Feelings that are complicated could relate to more detailed objects in the world, or multiple objects that are grouped together. Multiple objects grouped together could result in multiple feelings for each object, or one feeling altogether, for instance if someone goes into a room they get a feeling for that room.

If a robot had to look at a line of houses on a street, then the robot couldn't possibly recognize one street from another street because it would have to recognize all of the different houses on the street - and then label that street as the street that had all of the different houses in that order. Furthermore, each house would have to be 'abstracted' so that it could be more artistic or easily programmed and so that the robot could recognize the simple features of the house.

Ideas, Objects and Artificial Intelligence

So feelings have associated ideas, an idea can contribute to a feeling, or multiple ideas can contribute to feelings or a feeling. If humans have feelings then they use their feelings to think about their ideas, however, what then is the difference between ideas and feelings? Why wouldn't a human simply have ideas then, and not need to experience feeling?

Feelings certainly separate out ideas in terms of the time that the idea occurs to the person, and it could also have associated ideas, however, how do two ideas interact in terms of feeling? If a person has the idea of 'orange' and the idea of 'apple', then what happens when the person thinks of apples and oranges at the same time? And how would that be different from seeing an apple and an orange together on a table?

How are the feelings separate in the persons mind? They must be linked to other related objects in the persons mind like the category of 'fruit'. Things in the mind are associated with each other based upon their real life associations, but also based upon how the mind learned to associate those 'thought units' - or whatever you want to call them.

The mind works by association chains, basically.

How would two dissimilar items be related to each other then? The mind might have a feeling of 'fruit' if they thought about both an apple and an orange at the same time, or they might think of other individual fruits, or if the feeling that the fruit produces is similar to the feeling of a completely different object then it could be related in terms of similar feelings.

Heidegger wrote that objects in life can be misrepresented. That is a significant concept and is related to artificial intelligence and idea associations. Some ideas can be 'misrepresented' while other ideas are more simple and can be felt and understood easily - and obviously their association chains could be understood.

What does it mean to 'misrepresent' an object, then? Objects mean what they mean, it is very simple. How could it be a complex thing to misrepresent an object? Would that mean confusing one object with another object? Or would it mean confusing the feeling of an object?

So how would the details of idea and object associations play out? Furthermore, what would be considered to be 'advanced' thinking, if the mind only thinks with ideas and objects? It would seem like the mind thinks mostly with simple ideas and objects, and the ideas and objects each having associated and direct feelings.

Perhaps the feelings that certain groups of ideas or objects have lead to greater intellectual categories, for instance fruit could be related metaphorically to furniture, that could be a more intellectual and less direct association - that would be associated in the mind but would be more of an intellectual association. If someone thinks about fruit, then it could be related to furniture because they are both physical objects, but fruit is soft and furniture is hard.

How would that be intellectual? It doesn't seem like that would lead to any advanced thinking. However, it could lead to advanced thinking because all metaphors or comparisons that aren't direct could be harder to figure out or related via less direct associations.

Does that mean that all less direct associations are more intellectual, however? Maybe multiple feelings combine into categories that overlap and the entire thing becomes complicated and intellectual, or something like that.

Idea Associations

So the ideas related to each other with things called associations. Associations relate ideas to each other - they are connected through relationships in real life or cognitive relationships. If someone thinks about something then that could relate to something else that they think about, or the idea in their head could be different from how it is in reality - there is emotional realities and physical realities that could be related.

If it is an emotional reality then it could be difficult to figure out, obviously since emotions are subjective, and hard to measure. For instance if you want to relate how cool two different things are it would be impossible because one person could think that it is cool and another person could think it is not cool.

What kinds of emotional reality are measurable and less subjective then? How does emotional reality relate to artificial intelligence? If robots just need to assess objects and how objects are related to each other then they don't need to necessarily have any emotional intelligence.

If a robot needs to understand stuff, it doesn't need to assess emotions, it just needs to understand how to get around in reality. Understanding emotions is too complicated and only a human being could make subjective judgements.

Designing Robots

Just have the robots do stuff - it can't be that difficult to have them function properly. On one hand humans perform very simply -their actions are 'artistic' and can be performed by understanding their own feelings. On the other hand, their actions could be considered to be complex and cognitive and requiring conscious effort and thought.

If it requires conscious thought then the person needs to think about what is happening and how to perform in each instance - unless it is already learned (but metacognitive theories already addressed those ideas).

How is a robot supposed to understand that a house is a house, and that houses are where humans live? That seems like something a person would understand, however a robot wouldn't need to understand something like

that. What would a robot need to understand that is difficult or complex then, in order for it to be intelligent?

It needs to be capable of abstracting more, robots can be programmed to do lots of things - however that does not make them very intelligent. How could 'abstraction' be programmed into a robot? Abstraction is artistic and uses a humans feelings.

Robots need to be capable of organizing objects in an efficient manner, they don't necessarily need to understand emotions. How could understanding emotions be related to organizing objects, however? Maybe significant objects could generate more emotion, so the significant objects could be related to other significant objects and the insignificant features of an area be disregarded.

The significant features of an area are the features that are, well, significant. They can be significant for different things, different categories such as houses, interiors of houses, a category of objects that consists of things related to human beings, and so on.

What about the definitions of objects? An object could be recognized and its definition looked up by the robot. That way they could form associations - and human minds could be looked at to see what the typical associations are - does this object relate to that object - it has it in its definition after all.

How could a robot relate one object to another object? It looks up the definition of the object then compares the related features of the two different objects by looking at visual similarities - what about the amount of light shed on objects in a three dimensional space? If the robots can see in three dimensions then they can at least figure out the spacial significance of objects.

If a robot knows the spacial significance of objects then it should theoretically be capable of doing anything.

The definition of each object can be programmed in, and how it would relate to other objects and the significance of each object. If the definition can be described to the robot properly, then the robot should understand

everything - however, some things are very hard to understand and it could be difficult to describe it to the robot.

The robot can relate different things to each other, and fit them together spatially so it knows what to do in reality.

How powerfull and developed is the unconscious?

How powerful and significant is the unconscious mind?

The Phenomenological Realism of the Possible Worlds: The 'A Priori', Activity and Passivity of Consciousness, Phenomenology and Nature Papers and Debate of the Second International Conference Held by the International Husserl and Phenomenological Research Society New York, N. Y., September 4–9, 1972 (Analecta Husserliana)

edited by Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka

Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka / Imaginatio Creatrix: the creative versus the constitutive function of man, and the possible worlds

1. Human being appears as the major dynamic factor within this system not only with the respect to the progress onwards but also at the level of introducing the essential and basic level of meaning through the structurizing work of his consciousness.
1. the cognitive object and the cognitive act 'self-given' presence
2. imagination and expectation, the flow through which - as it seems
3. revindicating the basic role of the impulsive, emotive and affective dimensions of the passions

Those quotes by tymieniecka are basically just different ways of cognitive functioning - there is sensations, imaginaitons and expectations, and impusive drives, emotional drives, and affective drives - I would assume an affective drive differs from an emotional drive in that the affective is what is expressed and the emotional could be hidden and more unconscious. 'Revindicating' could mean the conscious mind reanalyzing and affirming the passions and tensions of the unconscious.

Mary Rose Barral / Continuity in the perceptual process:

1. but should we expect that phenomenology open to us every door?

1. this will therefore lessen the chance of witnessing a truly original perceptive experience which it may be possible to investigate phenomenologically, without presuppositions.

Those two quotes were separate in her article - but it brings up the question - what is an 'original perspective'? There can be conscious perspectives and unconscious perspectives - how the mind views the world consciously is completely different from how it sees the world unconsciously - what does that mean anyway - for consciousness to 'see' something? Baral described it as a 'perceptual process' or an 'original perspective experience' that you can 'investigate phenomenologically without presuppositions'. However the conscious mind always slants or views life differently from the unconscious mind - a person's unconscious mind is basically a different being from who they understand themselves to be.

Mario Sancripriano - The activity of consciousness - Husserl and Bergson

He is referring to writing by Husserl

1. The central chapter of *Erfahrung und Urteil* is dedicated to the general structure of the predication and to the genesis of the principle categorical forms. The detailed examination of the 'relation' has predisposed the reader to the most intimate process whereby consciousness rises from interests in perception to analysis of predicative activity in general in its diverse modalities and in its objective reference, to the comprehension of the same modalities (departing from their constituent origins) as modes of defining to themselves the ego. This analysis brings us nearer to a more accurate approximation to things, insofar as it may be conceded where the object was placed at a certain 'visual distance'. The full resolution of the cognitive tensions is thereby brought about.

Sancripriano put the words 'visual distance' in quotes - what could he mean by visual distance then? People can see the object of their perceptions at different distances, it is basically saying that perception can change how someone views the world or any individual object - there are also 'cognitive tensions, constituent origins, and different modalities' - what could all of those things be cognitively?

The mind needs to intellectualize everything that it processes - the unconscious mind first recognizes inputs from the external world and its internal processes and all of those processes are intellectualized and thought about in a more deep fashion. Is the conscious mind just a way of understanding the unconscious? There must be different levels of presence of mind - as Tymieniecka said that there were different levels of 'self-given' presence. Barral said that the mind has 'suppositions' and that there are different perspectives.

So what is going on exactly - what is the difference between the conscious mind and the unconscious mind? The unconscious mind is already understood by normal people as being the drives and thoughts that people have that they aren't fully aware of - however did people typically think of the unconscious mind as possibly being a different person? When someone is sleeping they are certainly like a different person, and often don't even remember what they were dreaming about - that is because there is a difference between the two consciousnesses and the people who arise from those consciousnesses.

What would it mean for the mind to 'intellectualize' something? Could that mean that the conscious mind - or who the person of the conscious mind is - understands something in recognition of itself and its own personality traits and characteristics?

I said in a previous article that 'consciousness can cause feelings and intellectual stimulation' - however what does that mean exactly? Is it the unconscious mind that causes the feelings and the stimulation. or is it the conscious mind, or is it the two together? It would be described as how someone's mind respond to external stimulation - the stimulation triggers a reaction in the mind which helps to determine the response. The reaction is conscious and unconscious, obviously - but what are the conscious and unconscious components?

So some of the components would be different factors from reality - the unconscious mind could recognize some factors while the conscious mind only recognizes others - it was already understood that people absorb somethings unconsciously and don't recognize them consciously, however there are more details that could be looked at like if the unconscious mind

‘understands’ what is going on and is processing information and emotions with a greater understanding of the persons feelings, ideas and other associations and thought and feeling structures.

The Mind - its Information and Emotions

Rationality is how rational someone is - or the term 'logical' could apply, and rationality relates to how someone processes information - or the philosophical field of epistemology. How a person uses their logic or rationality can help to determine how they think and understand information in the world.

What is a logical or rational understanding then, however? In a previous article i pointed out that there are different types of emotional understandings, and that these understandings are linked to cognitions and thought structures. Some thoughts are rational thoughts and are linked to emotional understandings, while other thoughts are normal thoughts or illogical thoughts and more simple 'understandings' - which i could call a 'unit of thought' or something of the sort.

What would a 'normal' thought be then however? Maybe some people think many more illogical or emotional thoughts than other people. If a thought that is logical could be defined by not being influenced by the persons emotions. A logical thought could have been developed because of irrational emotions, however it is more likely that logical thoughts that are more intelligent or practical were developed from experiences or thoughts = or some combination of experiences and thoughts that were uhm, interesting. Or not interesting, it doesn't really matter. It might matter if the experiences that developed the thoughts were interesting or not because salient experiences are more significant for the mind to understand and build upon.

Knowledge and Mental Representations

People have knowledge, and they use representations in order to process the information that they have. A mental representation could be of different

objects. Is a mental representation a vision then, or is it just a 'unit of knowledge'?

What objects in life need to be analyzed different from other objects? A word or object might have a definition that the person understands, and if the object is hard to comprehend then it might have a more complex vision or knowledge structure attached to it.

Some things in life are harder to understand than other things, however the question is what makes one thing harder to understand than something else? Is it an emotional understanding? Understanding emotions involves thinking about different subtleties that have emotional information - such as understanding human motivation.

Human motivation is certainly an emotional topic because it relates to peoples emotions and feelings. Anything that someone likes is going to trigger emotions because the person is emotionally interested or attached to it. Therefore analyzing something that relates to human interests is going to be emotional - doing mathematics isn't going to necessarily engage many emotions or be an emotional or feeling type of thinking - it is probably more visual, or unconsciously visual.

Emotions, Sensations and Knowledge

What is the relationship between feelings, sensations and knowledge?

Humans use feelings and sensations in order to understand the world, they then store this information in their minds as knowledge.

Feelings help humans think about the things that they think about. Everything that someone thinks about probably has an associated feeling.

'People have feelings and they think' - that may seem like a simple statement, however it is actually very complicated. There are many different feelings that humans can have, and they can think about many different things.

When a feeling triggers a thought, it is an extremely complicated process if you look at the details - on the surface it is a simple process, a feeling simply cause the person to feel something for a certain period of time, and during that time different and more subtle feelings are evoked that are associated with the main feeling.

So if there are smaller feelings involved with any major feeling, that means that the smaller feelings are going to be related or associated with the main feeling.

Different feelings can be logical or illogical - but what is a 'logical' feeling? Maybe some feelings people bias with their own personal emotions, these feelings could be more unconscious feelings because the unconscious is more emotional than the conscious mind.

So a thought could be influenced by unconscious feelings, and this could be considered or labeled as being more unconscious than a thought that the person thinks more clearly and consciously to themselves.

Perceptions and the unconscious

How could i describe the different ways of perceiving life or anything in it? Would there be a 'psychotic' way of perceiving it and a non-psychotic? a logical or a non-logical? a conscious or an unconscious? What might other ways of perceiving life be?

If someone perceives life from a psychotic viewpoint they might slant some of the information depending on their perspective. They might the slant the information in a non-logical manner so they can see the world the way they want to see it. Or perhaps emotional conditions placed upon them cause them to create a greater emotional emphasis on some things - probably the things which they are psychotic about.

So there is clearly a psychotic way of viewing the world - however this 'emotional bias' towards certain things in life can be applied to non-psychotic people, who could also put an emotional bias on different things.

There could be something in specific that they put an emotional bias on, or a group of related or dissimilar things.

Therefore some thoughts that a person might have could be illogical, and that could be compared to a psychotic person viewing something completely differently. What would the difference be between viewing something completely differently and viewing something only slightly differently then?

Maybe there are degrees to which something can make sense, and different amounts of logical can be used in viewing something.

What would be examples of something that could be viewed differently? Any experience or even an individual object could be made to not make sense or viewed in a psychotic fashion, it would seem.

Visual Distance and Consciousness

Sancipriano mentioned a 'visual distance' in an above quotation, however, what could the mind be perceiving exactly? Different things in life are perceived in different ways, and people are conscious of those things in different ways also.

Different things that people see are linked to different cognitions, and they trigger different mental representations.

A mental representation is a 'unit of thought' or some sort of understanding that the mind has. What is the nature of this understanding? The mind could be considered to be made up of different units of understanding.

How could the mind be made up of understandings? People simply understand different things, they understand how a car looks, they understand how the car makes them feel. There must be an understanding of how the car and looking at an automobile makes them feel and the 'actual' feeling. There is going to be a relationship between the unconscious feelings involved and the conscious feelings involved. If the person is using their consciousness to think about the understanding of how the car makes

them feel at the current time then that is probably more conscious, and less of an unconscious endeavor or feeling.

What is an 'actual' feeling?

An actual feeling is one that is probably fully harnessed by the unconscious mind. that means, however, that there must be some sort of interaction with the conscious mind. Depending on the feeling it might be that there needs to be some sort of conscious processing - in order for the feeling to coincide with conscious feelings you might need to think about the feeling or develop consciously in order to properly experience the feeling.

Which feelings and thoughts are 'actually' conscious?

SO which feelings and thoughts are 'actually' conscious then? It really varies a considerable amount depending on the circumstances in reality - however the conscious mind builds and changes its response to the feelings it receives in reality. Would the feeling-responses be defined as being conscious or unconscious then? Consciousness i have already stated is being understood as an iceberg, with most of the feelings and processes being beneath the surface.

Truth and Reality

What is truth? Does it come from our senses and the external world around us or can we trust our internal senses?

Intelligence is subjective and truth is subjective, truth is really just discovering what the most accurate emotional reality is - and measuring emotion is extremely subjective.

All the words the people use are really subjective then - anything complex that isn't scientific would be subjective - or could be considered to be subjective. there are different emotional concepts that are tied to different words - if Jung found out that everything in life was a mental construct or an archetype I don't know how he would react. There aren't just a few words that are significant that are archetypes - but practically every word that is psychologically significant or a mental construct is significant in some way.

When someone says the word 'god' that is significant as an exclamative or declarative word - they are making a statement or trying to convey emotion or distress. So the word 'god' is probably the best example for a word that is used to convey emotion because people say it when they are emotional - similar to using a swear word only swear words are more vulgar. So the word 'god' is used in a similar fashion to using swear words only it is less vulgar and possibly more emotional.

So when someone says the word 'god' what are they being subjective about? they are simply being emotional - it could be subjective to decide if they are emotional, however it might be obvious because of their facial expression or tone which could help convey if they are being emotional or what their feelings are.

So how emotional people are or how much they are feeling might not be so subjective because humans can see facial expression and tone of voice, etc. The more complex subjective feelings and ideas that people have might be harder to understand or prove, however.

How could all of reality be perceived? It would be perceiving everything all at once - in previous articles I mentioned that there was unconscious and conscious and emotional and cognitive perception. If someone views something emotionally then they are just looking at their emotions and how they look at it unconsciously - but if someone is perceiving something consciously it is a more conscious and deliberative attempt to view the world.

However, how is everything then perceived? What is the 'minds eye' so to speak? People don't just see the visual world but they perceive everything emotionally and cognitively. How could someone understand what they are taking in from the world around them?

There are different ways of understanding concepts and experiences intellectually - emotionally how life is experienced is rather simple because everything could just be described in emotional groupings - this event evoked this and that feeling, etc.

However the intellectual is much more complicated - animals could just experience emotions and feelings however if you think about an experience you could frame it in very different ways. Different experiences might evoke similar emotions - because there are only a few basic emotions, however someone could think about the experience in rather different ways.

What does that mean - to think about something in a different way? Someone could think about something with a different emotional perspective - for instance think angrily or pessimistically (sad); however that would just be thinking with the different emotional groupings that I already mentioned someone can feel with.

Any idea could tilt how someone views something intellectually. There might only be a few basic ideas just like there are a few basic emotions; however there are probably a lot more basic ideas than basic emotions because when someone thinks about something it is very different than from when they feel something.

An idea could be tied to an emotion or feeling - that is why feelings and emotions differ - because their associated ideas also differ.

How Does the Mind Process information?

A mental model could mean any kind of mental model. There are models of how emotion functions and models of how intellect functions - and models of how intellect functions and is processed in the mind with emotion.

SO what is the mental model for how the entire mind works then? First there is a sensory input -and then it is processed emotionally and cognitively by the mind. That seems rather obvious. Sensory inputs cause a reaction in the mind. That is what happens - there is some sort of stimulus - and then that stimulus causes a human to think about what that stimulus does for the person.

Different stimuli trigger mental reactions that can be cognitive or emotional. That happens all of the time when someone sees something that triggers a reaction. Vision helps humans to notice various kinds of stimuli. That means that the stimuli must be processed first by one of the human senses. That is only for external stimuli or stimulation, however. A stimulus or trigger could come from within the mind from memory or what the person is thinking about.

Emotional and Cognitive are intertwined

If there is an emotion stimulus (like seeing a dog) then that could trigger a cognitive or emotional reaction in a persons mind.

So what kind of reaction does it trigger? A cognitive reaction or an emotional reaction? A cognitive reaction would be considered or viewed as the person thinking more - while an emotional reaction would be the person feeling more. Since dogs are emotional it would probably trigger an emotional reaction and not a cognitive one - however, what if an emotional stimulus starts something cognitive? It might start off as emotional since the person is seeing a dog and dogs are cute and they are animals (and animals think less and are more feeling-based than humans) but that doesn't necessarily mean that it converts into being more emotional.

What kinds of thoughts would seeing something emotional (like a dog) trigger? What kinds of emotions would it trigger? If thought about that way then it seems simple - seeing something emotional would 'probably' trigger a more emotional reaction in the mind but could also just simply cause the person to think more depending on the mood that they are in. It would seemingly produce an association of similar ideas or feelings that the dog is associated with. However, the person might see dogs all of the time and in that case it wouldn't generate much more or different stimulation for the person.

Emotional and Cognitive Stimulation

So mental stimulation can be either emotional or cognitive. If the stimulation is emotional then it produces feelings; however cognitions can also produce feelings - an example of that would be someone laughing after hearing a good joke.

So what is the relationship between knowledge structures and emotional and cognitive stimulation? There must be some sort of emotional-cognitive relationship between each mental process or mental node that produces a combination of feelings or thoughts (i could call the thoughts 'intellectualizations')

Consciousness can also cause feelings or intellectual stimulation. What is that saying - that 'consciousness' can cause stimulation? That is basically just saying that someone is in a state of feeling in which they are largely aware of what they are feeling. So the question then is can someone direct what their feelings or thoughts are aware of? People have important feelings and less important thoughts and feelings. Can someones consciousness feel certain feelings better than other feelings? That person might more largely be aware of some types of stimulation more so than other types of stimulation then.

Different types of information could also be processed by the mind - not just different types of feelings. Feelings are also just communicative so they could fall under the title of 'information' in the mind. So feelings and thoughts are processed as information by the mind.

Mental Representations

Different ideas, concepts and thoughts can interact in the mind. One idea can be a 'meta-idea' - an idea of another idea, or an idea could simply be associated with another idea. If different ideas produce different feelings and different amounts of feeling then an idea that is a meta-idea of another idea could produce a similar or associated feeling.

The ideas don't even have to be of each other - one idea could be a further reflection of another idea without the person being aware that that is occurring. Meta-representation (meta-ideas) do not have to be conscious - humans naturally reflect on stuff and feelings and thoughts or 'intellectualizations' naturally reflect and build on each other.

David Rosenthal proposed that a representation is only conscious if it is presented by a higher-order thought. However, I don't believe that to be completely accurate - representations could be simply thought about more without the person consciously thinking about it to themselves. Thoughts that aren't conscious naturally reflect on other thoughts or ideas or experiences and these concepts or 'understandings' build in the mind naturally by themselves. Furthermore, Any time someone becomes more conscious of something it could be the result of a feeling enhancing another feeling - not necessarily a thought enhancing another thought.

For instance - if someone 'has a feeling' for something and they then think more about it they don't need to necessarily be consciously directing that feeling (the further 'meta' feeling) because humans minds naturally reflect on things all of the time and they don't need to consciously say to themselves 'I need to think more about that'. It could simply be a feeling in their mind that triggered another feeling or there are possibly 'reflective feelings' whose purpose is to reflect and build and make more conscious other feelings. These feelings could be understandings of experiences or understandings of anything in life (though i would think that most understandings would be of experiences).

Florid vs Pastel Representations

Daniel Dennett suggested that there are representations that involve a sense of action or agency which he called 'florid' representations while 'pastel' representations are more basic intentions that do not necessarily involve as much intention.

However, how does a representation have an intention? A representation could be an idea - and in that case, the representation could have intentions attached. If the representation is a feeling it could also have intentions attached. An intention is a strong feeling - so it could be obvious that some representations have strong feelings or other thoughts attached.

Why do they need to even be labelled 'representations' then - I could just say that some ideas have stronger motivations and feelings attached than other ideas, and that some ideas form ideas or 'understandings' of other ideas that could be objects in the world or other concepts in the persons mind. However, when some object or idea is 'represented' as or in another idea or object in the mind it is called a meta-representation, or just a 'representation of another representation'.

So the term representation does have some use - because people represent things in the world that are happening all of the time. There is a difference then between the definition of an 'understanding' and a 'representation'. Humans could have understandings of anything basically, some of the stuff in the world is going to be represented in their mind as a single object, and other stuff is just going to be 'understood' as an 'understanding' to the person. 'Understandings' could involve multiple representations and 'understandings of understandings' could involve multiple meta-representations.

The important question then is - which components of our representations or understandings have strong feelings attached? That is what Dennett suggested by his distinction between 'florid' and 'pastel' representations. The word 'florid' by definition means elaborately or excessively intricate or complicated or excessive - so that makes it obvious that some feelings have components that are more motivated or salient.

The Use of Representations

Dennett also pointed out that there is knowing and a use to representations - if someone simply has a representation that is different from it being a practical representation. This is different from 'symbols' in my view because some symbols have a greater significance on the human psyche. That makes it seem simple - obviously different objects in the environment are going to have a greater psychological impact than other objects, and different objects are going to be represented differently.

Take is a step further and it becomes obvious that different mental constructs interact with each other within the mind. Mental constructs have been defined a long time ago - Carl Jung talked about mental constructs when discussing dreams and other significant psychological phenomena. I would think that much could be understood if it could be sorted out the different mental constructs - these are different from simply grouping ideas and subjects and experiences and 'understandings' in life into different categories - but the significance of each would need to also be understood.

The question then is - which subjects or categories or experiences could form a significant mental construct? Do different emotions form mental constructs? Can different thoughts or constructs be formed from significant life experiences and the emotions that these experiences generate? Then is it simply an emotional world that needs to be analyzed? If complex mental constructs can be formed it is certainly more complex than a few simple categories in life evoking certain emotions.

This is obviously going to be more complicated than simple symbols, a physical symbol is going to be more simple than a mental symbol - if you could call a mental symbol a representation anyway. Jung called significant mental constructs or symbols 'archetypes'. However - those are just single symbols or constructs - what would happen if a mental construct combined with another mental construct? A representation is just a single object - but a representation can be of a mental construct which could consist of multiple representations, and different mental constructs can combine and influence each other in the mind - and obviously are going to be emotionally significant.

Object Representations

One form of a mental representation is simply objects from the world forming a mental representation - either multiple objects in someones vision or a single object in someones vision - this is called the 'object-based attention' model - Montemayor and Haladjian (2015)[\[footnote\]](#): Consciousness, Attention and Conscious Attention. (2015) Montemayor and Maladjian. The MIT Press.

Such diverse theories and studies give us good reason to believe that different attention systems work together in complementary ways to process perceptual information, and that object-based attention is an evolutionarily newer processing strategy that developed after the more basic feature-based and spatial forms of attention. The usefulness of the object-based model of high-level representation is that it provides a structure wherein low-level information from the various visual pathways can be integrate to form a coherent and persisting representation of a visual object (Ballard et al. 1997, Kahneman, Teisman, and Gibbs 1992, Noles, Scholl, and Mitroff 2005). Some studies, however, suggest that this binding can happen even when pairs of features are simply superimposed spatially (Holcombe and Cavanagh 2001) and thus not necessarily bound in an object file format. Nevertheless, such forms of 'conjunction attention' enable the crucial integration of multiple features. This ability is particularly important for guiding actions and for conscious attention, which we discuss further in chapter 4. Our position is that before you can have a conscious representation, visual information must be organized in some useful way. Object file representations provide this organization, especially since visual features usually belong to discrete objects. Without the ability to select an individual object and bind its feature, an agent could not sustain a persisting representation of the object.(We are particularly drawn to the object-based attention model because it provides a nice structure for the integration of information from the various visual subsystems to form a coherent representation of a visual scene, in a way that allows mental representations to refer to external objects. Whether or not mental representations truly are organized via object files remains debatable, but for our purposes the form in which features are integrated is not problematic as long as there is some account for this integration. we believe that object files are

theoretically important for providing the content of mental representations and for integrating perceptual information from multiple modalities, as well as from other forms of attention, in order to produce a coherent representation. It is these representations that most likely make up the contents of conscious experience

I already mentioned in a previous article that vision was like the base-line cognition. They stated that vision is necessary for mental representations, which I pointed out before them that vision was the baseline cognition which is basically saying the same thing. People that can see use their vision to think, and when they aren't looking with their eyes open they are visualizing things which they are thinking about. That is going to influence their cognitions greatly because vision is always needed and is a part of the thought process.

I also pointed out in my previous article that vision is tied to more simple cognitions - which seems fairly obvious on the surface but could be extremely complicated if someone wanted to analyze it because it would basically be analyzing all of a human's thinking and where that thinking comes from. Does it come from vision, emotion or feeling or other thoughts or memories?

Measuring Emotion and Subjectivity

So far in this article I discussed mental representations and how they influence the mind cognitively and emotionally. The question that comes up when trying to measure how reality is expressed and represented in the mind is how could such subjective mental functions be measured?

Some things in life are obvious and their influence on the human mind is obvious also - however it isn't really that simple. Things in life have an unconscious and a conscious influence on people. If the influence is unconscious then it could be completely unknown what the influence is. Alvin Goldman phrased meta-representations on a simple lower level 'first order representation level' and a higher level a 'meta-representational' level. There are simple beliefs and desires on the first level and the second level is more reflective - it is a meta-representational level by which people think

about their attitudes and their basic representations of the world - their basic beliefs and desires.

He talks about 'mental attitudes' and these attitudes are different from concepts. If someone has an attitude then it is different from a concept that they can form. Attitudes come from beliefs and desires and intentions and other mental attitudes - however - how do these attitudes become concepts? [\[footnote\]](#)

The Mentalizing Folk. Alvin Goldman. (2000) In Dan Sperber (Ed.)
Metarepresentations. Oxford University Press

What concepts do the folk have of mental representations? How do they conceptualize or represent to themselves such states as belief, desire, intention, and the other mental attitudes? What properties do they endow these states with, in their fundamental grasp of them? These questions should be contrasted with questions about the essential nature of mental states. ...do not conceptualize beliefs and desire as neural states. How do they conceptualize them?

So they conceptualize by looking at their first level representational state - their basic beliefs and desires - then they form higher or more complex representations of those basic needs. This might be related to a hierarchy of needs because it has to do with different levels of thinking. Thinking is basically the same as different levels of representation, because, just as the world is represented simply and more complex, so too can thinking be simple and complex - and it can be about the world or about the self and world intertwined.

The Components of Consciousness - Mental and Phenomenological Processes

Subjective Perception

How are various experiences in life perceived mentally? What does that mean anyway - to perceive something mentally. I wrote in a previous article that life can be viewed or perceived cognitively and emotionally. If life can be perceived in different ways then it can give rise to different experiences. Different emotional and intellectual experiences.

Different 'things' in life can be phrased in different ways. How can the experiences or phenomena in life be divided? People usually simply use the term 'thing' but phenomena could be experiences or occurrences. How does that relate to verbal phrasing, however? If someone uses a different word then it could mean something completely different then using another word or phrasing something differently. You would need to look closely at the definition of the word and see what it does for someone psychologically - and assume that it would have a similar psychological impact on different or similar people.

There are also conscious and unconscious phenomena - that makes sense - if something can be conscious or unconscious it is also going to be tied to its conscious or unconscious phenomena in the real world.

Unconscious Perception

What is an unconscious perception? If there can be unconscious perception and conscious perception then what is the difference between the two? Is that the same as asking what the difference is between consciousness and unconsciousness?

If something is unconscious then it isn't conscious - but what does that mean? If you understand something consciously then that means that you are aware of it - you understand it and are possibly aware of that understanding. However where is the line between being aware of the phenomena and a meta-awareness (aware that you are aware)?

There could be an endless number of degrees of awareness to different things - and different types of awareness - some of the awareness is going to be meta-awarenesses - awareness of other types of awareness - and some of the awareness is going to awareness of stuff that doesn't require further reflection or you already know you are aware of.

If someone already knows that they are aware of something then it doesn't require further reflection.

Consciousness is multifaceted

There are different ways of being conscious - the two most obvious are unconscious vs aware or conscious. Other ways are emotionally conscious, verbally conscious, semi-conscious or conscious in a speculative way, intuitively conscious, immediately conscious, more fully conscious, slightly conscious, visually conscious, some combination of visually conscious and emotionally or cognitively conscious, or some combination of all of those ways.

Different ideas or objects in life are mental constructs - so a simple object could represent a more complex mental representation. That idea significant because it can be applied to all mental cognitions or architectures. All mental or intellectual interactions in the mind have their own mental representations and are linked to other thoughts or representations. A representation of a park could be tied in with the representation of a picnic - or I could simply say that the events or meaning or definition of someone having a picnic is tied in directly or in a more complicated way with the persons conceptions of parks - it could be much complicated than simply tying in the ideas of 'picnic' and 'park' and arriving at the conclusion that 'you have picnics at parks'.

Some stuff in life is obvious and can be more conscious than stuff that isn't obvious. That relates to how conscious or unconscious ideas or experiences are. How is an experience emotionally or intellectually absorbed? How else can an experience be processed by the mind? Maybe it can be stored more visually or more unconsciously - so it might be stored unconsciously but

stored intellectually even though it might seem like the experience should be stored emotionally since the unconscious is emotional.

If an experience is processed emotionally what does that mean? Would that mean that it makes the person happier or is it possible to process pain in an emotional way - pain is more physical so I don't know if you could say that humans process pain emotionally. It is different to say that there is an emotional component to pain than to say that pain is processed emotionally. Obviously it is processed physically but that doesn't necessarily mean that it processed cognitively and felt more deeply. Clearly someone in physical pain is feeling a lot - but they probably aren't as emotional as when they are having fun or experiencing more pleasurable physical stimulation.

Subjective Reality

What is an emotional reality? The physical reality is obvious - that would simply be what happens in the world physically - how that affects a persons mind is much more complicated, however.

A single physical reality can influence the different components of consciousness - how someone is aware of the different components of reality. Those components become a part of the persons mind in various ways - with the other major factor being what the persons mind is thinking and feeling independently and how that changes based upon the different inputs from reality.

People need to be aware of what the reality is otherwise their minds could simply determine how they interpret reality unconsciously - instead of it being something more under your control or that you are at least aware of.

So the question then is - how does someones mind influence the reality in their mind - or how does their understanding of reality or how they are influenced - influence their own mind?

Defining Components of Mind

In order to sort out the task of 'discovering the mental and physical reality' first the different components of mind and reality need to be defined.

Components of Reality

- Unconsciousness or the elements of your unconscious that someone isn't aware of
- The feelings and thoughts that someone is aware of
- More complicated aspects of consciousness such as the ideas their reality is making them or leading ('influencing') them to think
- The conclusions people reach based off what they think the reality is - not just the 'background' ideas that are ideas that people have that influence them significantly that they aren't aware of - such as delusions or not-so-delusional delusions
- That means that there are different levels of ideas that people hold with different amounts of influence over their minds - some ideas are more delusional and they have different amounts of influence over their feelings and other cognitions
- The rest of physical and emotional processing and how that ties in with their higher cognitions - much of the physical stimulus might be obvious but it can be emotional or intellectual as well (like how the ideas that people hold and think about can be different degrees of emotional and cognitive)

Is Mental Reality Subjective?

First off - what could be a 'mental reality'? It could mean different things or be perceived in different ways. Is the mental reality in peoples minds the physical reality that they interpreted from the real world? Or is the mental reality subjective and something that their minds created?

There are different components of the intellectual. There is obvious intellectual - some things are more obvious or important intellectually while other ideas or understanding is more detailed or less important - or less detailed and sort of important, etc.

Some ideas or understandings are very important - but what are some of those understandings? It wouldn't be like the understanding of how to do

cooking or solve mathematics problems. Perhaps it could be an understanding of how to interact with other people or a persons understanding of their own emotions.

Some understandings are going to be more related to consciousness or the self. This would incorporate a hierarchy of needs relevant to what is most important to someones sense of self or core emotions. It is different from a hierarchy of needs for survival - it is a hierarchy of needs for personal satisfaction and the attainment of higher consciousness - which is a key goal that human development has focused on for millennia.

So there are different intellectual things that humans can focus on at different times. There are different intellectual skills that they can have and different understandings of those skills. Once a birdy, twice a wordy, once a birdy, twice is there, once a birdy, twice a wordy - once a birdy, twice is there. Twice is here, twice is there, twice twice twice, over there. That is an intelletual understanding of a rhyme. How could that understanding possibly be significant? It doesn't even make any sense - it just sounds rhythmical. How could a song influence someone intellectually? It wouldn't really matter that much I suppose. Songs can make people feel what the emotion is behind what the song is - that is obvious if you look at a song and analyze it and think about the feelings that it generates. Songs could generate a humorous mood or a sad or happy mood. But are all intellectual cognitions like songs? With songs it seems obvious - songs are emotional and carry emotion easily - but would a certain conversation or environment create emotion in the same obvious manner that a song would? A song conveys the emotion of the theme or message of the song (or the rhythm) - however other emotions are much more complicated - the question that brings up is that perhaps making more complicated emotions makes the emotions dulled down because there are so many emotions - it isn't a simple emotion like how a song has one simple emotion.

So, if there are many different emotions and complicated ways of feeling is mental reality then subjective and diverse - or concrete and obtuse?

How is Intellect Processed in the Mind?

I stated in previous articles that different feelings and thoughts are connected in the mind - and that the feeling or thought of one thought can influence the feeling or thought of another.

However, that means that certain ideas or thoughts can have a tangible presence and influence the feelings of other ideas and thoughts. They can also be grouped into categories - for instance a humans delusional or emotional thoughts could be exerting feelings while their logical or non-emotional and intellectual thoughts are producing conflicting feelings with the more intelligent thoughts at the same time. Such an interaction would be an example of cognition interaction with emotion - a humans cognitive or more intellectual thoughts could be exerting a certain type of feeling while their less intelligent or emotional thoughts could be producing a different type of feeling.

Cognition and emotion are always in balance - just like the left brain is theorized to be more logical and right brain is theorized to be more emotional and those two brains are always in balance - so tp emotion is always in balance with intellect or cognition.

WHy would a thought balance an emotion? If more intellectual thoughts are more conscious - and more emotional thoughts are less conscious - than that makes sense because thoughts are single points of information while emotions would probably take a longer time to experience than a thought - so say someone is experiencing an emotion - they could suddenly stop experiencing that emotion and think certain thoughts or even just initiate a period of more intellectual thinking which could stop the emotion, assist the emotion or hinder the emotion.

So certain types of thoughts are going to be more emotional and possibly assist emotion more than other thoughts that people can think. If the thoughts are delusional that might make the person more emotional than thoughts that make sense and are logical. There are also ideas and thoughts that can be grouped together - if someone thinks something through more clearly then maybe they can make the idea or thought structure more intellectual and less emotional. If it is more intellectual it could interfere more with emotional processes because thinking too much stops emotion or feeling.

It is obvious how thinking or thoughts could interfere with emotions = if someone is feeling good about something and they then think - 'I hate that thing' then it could stop the feeling good about the emotion completely. If someone continues the good emotion with thoughts that assist the positive emotion then the intellect or thoughts would be encouraging the emotion. However, if they think too much then they might become less emotional about it because they would be interfering the emotional process.

So someones emotions could be feeling one thing (that would be like a thought or group of ideas - but they would being conveyed by the persons emotions) and their intellect (which is more conscious) could be thinking about or conveying something completely different. The emotional is unconscious - so unconsciously someones emotions could be making the person feel stupid and telling them that they are emotional and stupid while their intellect could be trying to override their emotions and make them think clearer.

The persons emotions could be telling them one idea unconsciously while they could be trying to communicate or enforce a different idea to their mind consciously.

Ideas can be cognitive or emotional

Ideas that people have can be conscious ideas or not conscious ideas - they can come from the conscious mind or they can be more unconscious. If they are conscious they it is probable that the person thought about them more consciously to themselves then an idea that came from their unconscious mind. How could a thought even stem from the unconscious anyway? Some ideas people simply absorb or learn from their environment and the person doesn't necessarily need to think about as consciously.

If the person doesn't think about the idea as consciously then it could still be understood consciously - they just might not be able to verbalize it as clearly. That makes sense - it depends on what the ideas and concepts are basically. Some ideas could be very conscious while others could be very unconscious - that brings up the point of how someone would define a 'conscious' idea versus an 'unconscious' idea or concept.

Other than the fact that the unconscious concept the person wouldn't be described as being as consciously aware of anyway - some concepts a person could be aware of in a different way yet could still be described as being conscious of. Some concepts don't need that much conscious thinking about either - if someone is hungry they don't really need to think that much about that in order to understand that they are hungry - their body is communicating the information about how hungry they are and they become aware of that because they are in touch with their physical senses - that is all that is required to be aware of that in that circumstance - a slight physical awareness.

Other things that people might be aware of could require large amounts of intellect, however. All animals know when they need to eat and when they are hungry - so that isn't a very complicated desire. What about social cues - those might be hard for a person to process consciously and could be unconscious for a long period of time before they become more absorbed consciously. All of a person's emotions could be unconscious to different degrees and further thought could influence how much they 'absorb' or understand those emotions.

A Discussion about the Mind and Consciousness

How does the mind decipher meaning?

Or I might ask another question - what exactly does that mean? What is meaning in the mind anyway?

An example would be an expression or any saying basically - say someone says 'red apples taste good'. That statement has a certain significance for both the listeners and the person making the statement. Depending on their experience and understanding of how red apples taste their understanding of the statement is going to differ.

That was just a verbal example, however. The mind also gets meaning from its surroundings and physical phenomena. The red apples by themselves, for instance, might give the person an experience from just seeing the apples but probably more of one when they eat one of the apples.

So there is verbal or intellectual experience and physical or phenomenal experience - the important question then is how do these two types of experience relate to each other - here Heil states Davidson's theory (Heil, J):

Davidson argues that ... every mental token is identical with some physical token. Your being in pain at midnight is (let us imagine) identical with some physical (presumably neurological) event occurring in your body at midnight, although there is no prospect of translating talk of pain into neurological talk.

That theory received a lot of criticism, and I can see why. It doesn't seem like that would ever be literally true - as a guideline it might make some sense that mental events or states correspond with what is going on physically with the body at any time, however they probably aren't exact because different factors are going to be determining someones mental cognitions than the factors determining their physical biology.

Concepts

According to the classical theory of concepts, concepts have are complex mental representations that have a definitional structure (the concept fits properties according to its definition).

Other theories developed such as the prototype theory and the dual theory. The prototype theory suggests that concepts fit a stereotypical prototype (kind of like Jungian archetypes). The dual theory developed later and suggests that concepts have a 'core' and an 'identification procedure'. However 'Conceptual Atomism' suggests that concepts don't have any structure and they just correspond with what they represent - be that casual or historical.

In another article of mine [m52492](#) I reference James Sully (1892) who points out that concepts have three parts - abstraction, comparison and generalization. That suggests that people go through a process of thinking for each concept - they compare the concept to other concepts, generalize the concept - but first just have an abstract picture of the concept.

His simple explanation basically just points out that concepts involve thinking 'more' about each concept - including generalizing it. The other theories of concepts all have valid points as well however. The prototype theory suggests generalization is involved (as prototypes are generalized). And the dual theory suggests that identification is involved (which is similar to comparison). While the atomism theory suggests that it is just a simple thought process - which would be the 'abstraction' phase of understanding the concepts.

Concepts and experiential qualities

So how would a thought process of a concept occur in the mind? First you would think a little about the concept - an abstraction - then you would think more about the concept and possibly compare it to other concepts or even the real experiences involving the concept (such as when the concept occurred in a real life situation) and then you would come to a conclusion about the concept and generalize it as this or that type of concept (It doesn't necessarily occur in that order, however - these are my theories).

How might someone know when a concept is being thought about? Humans probably think about a lot of advanced concepts all the time. They might

only know about their thoughts or concepts some of the time however, and certainly not the full implications or experiential aspects of them (much of this must be unconscious).

Some Questions about the Mind

- One question is about perception - is its aim to provide accurate perceptions? When you consider how the unconscious mind thinks versus how the conscious mind thinks then the answer is no because many things you simply want a feel for and therefore couldn't possibly have an accurate perception of.
- What is the relationship between attention to action and awareness of mind? Clearly being aware of one's physical actions gives a sense of self or agency - and that therefore is a part of 'being present' or getting a feel for yourself and the people around you.
- How subjective is pain introspection and emotional introspection? Are pain and emotion second hand representations that come from thoughts of the original pain or are they direct feelings? Is a model of pain or emotion needed in mind in order for these feelings to be processed?
- Are there different levels to representations? Is a meta-representation a representation of another representation or is it the same representation just thought about more? What happens when someone thinks more about a representation or compares it with other representations? Can the mind be divided up that way - based on individual representations or do representations 'merge' into each other (i.e. the feeling or thought of one representation influencing the feeling or thought of another).

Some Questions about Concept and Image Associations

- When a concept is thought about more than its initial abstraction, is it thought about verbally or non-verbally - or some combination of both?
- When a concept is compared with other concepts that are related or similar - or not related and dissimilar - is it compared by using words or by using comparative images?
- I would think that when a concept is thought about 'more' it is automatically compared to similar concepts because similar things in life are naturally associated with each other.

- Is visual processing (processing of visual images or visual thinking) unconscious or conscious? That is, when the mind uses images to think does it do so unconsciously or consciously?
- Images naturally accompany thought all of the time, both consciously and unconsciously. It is hard to figure out or explain how exactly this occurs, however.
- For instance, there could be fast, more unconscious images or slow, deliberate and conscious images that accompany thoughts.
- Would the unconscious images be as useful or informative as conscious images? How is it even possible to 'partially' visualize an event or idea or experience?

Words provide management of images

Words manage and direct the imagination process. It would be hard to go through a sequence of thinking about one or multiple things simply by visualizing their occurrences. Here (Paivio, 1979) talks about the two processes of images and words and how they relate:

One important hypothesis concerning the interaction of the processes is that images are particularly effective in promoting rapid associations while verbal processes give them direction. something of this kind has been suggested, for example, by Rugg in connection with the requisites of the creative act, which are said to include "a well filled storehouse of imagery to guarantee richness and freedom of association, and of ordered key concepts to guarantee organization of thought" (1963, p. 311). Imagery is characteristic of autistic thinking in general and in that context is free of logical restraints; verbal processes superimposed on such imagery presumably contribute order and direction. These hypothesized, mutually supportive functions of images and words can be viewed as a consequence of the relative weighing of parallel processing and sequential processing features in the two systems: Imagery having both spatially and operationally parallel properties, is likely to be characterized by freedom and speed of association, whereas the sequentially organized verbal system is capable of providing organization to the associative process.

Some Questions about Representations, Images and Abstraction

- Are there different levels of the complexity of mental images?
- Can an image be thought about more by making a more complex or sequentially next image of it?
- If one image fits one representation, then it could be said that there are 'images' and 'meta- images (or visualizations)' and that those are comparable to representations and meta-representations.
- How do visualizations and images relate to the concreteness or abstractness of mental concepts?
- Would an abstract concept be harder to visualize or easier than a concrete concept?
- For instance, visualizing numbers might be simple but visualizing an abstract concept might be challenging if its symbol is difficult to understand (but it might be 'understood' unconsciously).
- So visions or images can take on a simple, unconscious form perhaps like in dreams with dream symbols and images.
- I guess that unconscious image processing is more simple than conscious processing - like how the images in dreams are more simple than images people have when they are conscious.

Conclusion

Images are used to compare and contrast conceptual information. People think about their experiences with these unconscious images and thoughts. A concept could be a summary or example of a certain type of experience, and using images would probably create more detail for the concept. Words obviously trigger and direct conceptual thinking, however the content of conceptual thinking comes from feelings or visualizations. Visualizations might be tied in with fast thinking or slow, emotional thinking. Doing math doesn't require emotional processes but would require complex visual processes but not necessarily complex conceptual thought - since most advanced thought is actually emotionally based and might or might not use emotional processes when thinking.

The question then would be when is an emotional process used in thinking. I mentioned that math doesn't require emotional processes and was just visual. Many concepts are just visual even if they are emotional concepts, however - so this could be difficult to figure out.

Bibliography

Heil, J. (2003) 'Mental Causation'. In Stich, S and Warfield, T. (Eds) The Blackwell Guide to Philosophy of Mind. Blackwell publishing

Paivio, A (1979) Imagery and Verbal Processes. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

How do our ideas influence our emotions?

Human beings get inspired by different types of information or different things. Some stuff in life is boring, while other stuff is interesting. That is significant because experiences or emotions that are fun or happy could be interesting - or would probably be interesting, but could also be boring, even though they are happy experiences.

That would seem rather obvious - what makes an experience a happy experience? There is cognition and emotion - human emotions are influenced by their thoughts and their understanding of events. They want something to be cool - and that then influences their emotions to want the thing to actually be cool and generate positive emotions for them.

So there are happy things in life and sad things. Woody Allen said that life is tragedy, with a dash of comedy. That is a significant statement. How do happy emotions combine with sad emotions? Humans cannot be happy all of the time - although it seems like dogs and cats might be.

Maybe there is no such thing as a single emotion. I previously understood that there could be multiple emotions, and possibly a single dominant emotion. However maybe it is more complicated than that - for instance maybe emotions could combine into each other in the mind. They would certainly influence each other.

That would mean that an experience has multiple emotions, that all come from the same experience. That would seem rather obvious, however it is complicated for various reasons. When something in an experience becomes an emotion it could be misrepresented - Heidegger wrote about how objects could be misrepresented.

Emotions emotions emotions are free - emotions emotions emotions for me - one one one one one one two three, emotion is for me. Emotion is extraordinary.

That was not a logical paragraph. Paragraphs are only logical if they have multiple supporting points.

If someone rambles on stupidly and emotionally then it isn't very logical. So that means that the persons emotions would be influencing their thoughts - or acting with their thoughts. That is significant informatoin becasue humans have emotions all of the time, and it is useful to know when their emotions are influencing their thoughts.

Emotions are feelings - feelings make humans motivated and to do things and think things. If someone is motivated to do something then they could do lots of stuff. Human emotion is powerful and their ideas are influenced by their emotions.

The ideas that humans hold are influenced by their emotions. Humans have lots of ideas, and each idea could be influenced by different motivations and drives and desires.